

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 56 and 63 have been amended. Claims 1-63 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 63

On page 2 of the Action, claim 63 is objected to because the Examiner states that the phrase "but for", in line 10, should be written as "except for". Claim 63 is amended herein to recited "except for", as suggest by the Examiner. Thus, the objection is respectfully overcome.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-62 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 USC §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER HSU ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,377,956 B1) IN VIEW OF WORLD WIDE WEB CONSORTIUM, *XML SCHEMA PART I: STRUCTURES*, W3C WORKING DRAFT (MAY 6, 1999)

The rejections of claims 1-63 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 and 56 are amended herein to clarify that one structured document file-system directory stores a plurality of structured documents obtained by conversion of the plurality of non-structured documents.

Therefore, according to amended independent claims 1 and 56, a single hub document format structured document is prepared from a plurality of structured documents stored in a single structured document file-system directory. According to the embodiments recited in independent claims 1 and 56, since it is only required upon preparation of a hub document to refer to a predetermined storage area (the structured document file-system directory), a hub document can be prepared rapidly and readily, and the operation burden to a preparing person is light and a high operation efficiency can be achieved.

In contrast, Hsu et al. (hereinafter "Hsu") and *XML Schema Part I* are totally silent with regards to setting in advance one structured document file-system directory storing a plurality of structured documents obtained by conversion of the plurality of non-structured documents; and

preparing a single hub document format structured document from a plurality of structured documents stored in one structured document file-system directory. Thus, the cited art cannot realize the aforementioned effects of the present invention recited in independent claims 1 and 56.

Furthermore, in the Response to Arguments (B), on page 11 of the Action, the Examiner states that *XML Schema Part I* teaches automatically adding the entity declarations to the hub document responsive to the presence of the structured documents in the structured document file-system directory by acquiring document names of the structured documents stored in the structured document file-system directory and preparing corresponding entity declarations referring to the structured documents, as recited in independent claim 1, citing section 3.6.2, on page 38.

As the Examiner suggests, *XML Schema Part I* states, “[e]xternal parsed entities are a feature of XML that offers a method for including well-informed XML document fragments, including text and markup, by direct reference to the storage object of the parsed entity.” The cited portion of *XML Schema Part I* merely provides a method of incorporating sub-documents or document fragments into a single document by simply referencing the storage location of the sub-documents.

In contrast, the present invention is characterized by *automatically* adding entity declarations to the hub document *responsive to the presence of the structured documents in the structured document file-system directory*. That is, the present invention is capable of determining the presence of a structured document, which is formed by converting the non-structured documents stored in the original document file-system directory into structured documents and storing the structured documents into the structured document file-system directory, and automatically adding entity declarations of the hub document when such a structured document exists.

The cited portions of *XML Schema Part I* make no mention of adding entity declarations to the hub document. In fact, *XML Schema Part I* does not even discuss whether its document fragments are grouped together automatically, responsive to the presence of such document fragments. To the contrary, it appears in the example provided in section 3.6.2, on page 39, that a user is forced to manually declare the external parsed entities, as well as their storage objects.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or even suggest automatically adding the entity declarations to the hub document responsive to the presence of

the structured documents in the structured document file-system directory by acquiring document names of the structured documents stored in the structured document file-system directory and preparing corresponding entity declarations referring to the structured documents, without further amending the claims at this time.

Further, the Examiner has not taken into consideration the claim amendments filed September 27, 2005, in which the preambles of independent claims 1 and 56 were amended to recite that the hub document preparation method/apparatus is for use in a computer system having a file system to manage data by storing the data in a file-system directory. Therefore, the rejections of independent claims 1 and 56 are improper, with respect the amended scope of independent claims 1 and 56.

Accordingly, the rejections of independent claims 1 and 56 are respectfully traversed. Dependent claims 2-55 depend from claim 1, and claims 57-62 depend from claim 56. Dependent claims 2-55 and 57-62 inherit the recitations of their respective base claim and, thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-55 and 57-62 also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 63 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 USC §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE SATO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,014,680) IN VIEW OF WORLD WIDE WEB CONSORTIUM, XML SCHEMA PART I: STRUCTURES, W3C WORKING DRAFT (MAY 6, 1999)

On pages 8-10 of the Action, independent claim 63 is rejected as being unpatentable over Sato et al. in view of *XML Schema Part I*, for reasons similar to those discussed above for independent claims 1 and 56. However, the deficiencies of *XML Schema Part I*, discussed above, are also apparent in the rejection of claim 63. It is further submitted that Sato et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of *XML Schema Part I*, discussed above

Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, the rejection of claim 63 is also respectfully traversed and should be allowed.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed April 13, 2006 apparently overlapping issuance of the outstanding Office Action by several days. A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is concurrently filed herewith pursuant to 37 CFR 1.97(e)(1). Consideration and acknowledgement of the references cited therein are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 11, 2006

By: Michael P. Stanley
Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501